



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the author correctly ascribes to the question of political democracy the great determining influence on British governmental and public opinion toward the North. Evidence that even during the Civil War men understood this is given in a quotation from an address of welcome by Henry Ward Beecher to Goldwin Smith in 1864. Speaking of his own tour of England Beecher said, "All classes who, at home, were seeking the elevation and political enfranchisement of the common people, were with us. All who studied the preservation of the State in its present unequal distribution of political privileges, sided with that section in America that were doing the same thing."

But while Mr. Villiers's general presentation of national attitudes is excellent and very well worth reading in both countries, the facts of history which are brought into his narrative are unfortunately not so well understood by him. They are even erroneously stated and hence lead to misinterpretations. One may pass over such errors as "Frederickburg" and "forty-three forty or fight", but to omit any mention of "right of search" in the *Trent* affair is to fail in appreciation of what amounted to an American obsession. A more positive error is the confusion of Seward's "Some thoughts for the President's Consideration" with the draft of the instruction to Adams, which Lincoln altered; another confusion on the critical moment in British policy as regards intervention is between the real "Crisis in Downing Street" (as C. F. Adams phrased it) of October–November, 1862, and the Lindsay-Roe-buck fiasco of midsummer, 1863. The two episodes are interwoven by the author as if they were one, and Earl Russell's position wholly misinterpreted. As regards Lincoln's emancipation moves, there is no mention and no understanding of his "border state policy". The blockade was not declared on April 19, 1861—rather a proclamation was issued notifying neutrals of the *intention* to blockade. These are the more striking evidences of a lack of sound historical study and are the more to be regretted as weakening the readable and just generalizations on the attitude of British and American peoples and governments.

E. D. ADAMS.

Die Deutsche Geschichtschreibung von den Befreiungskriegen bis zu unseren Tagen: Geschichte und Kulturgeschichte. Von GEORG VON BELOW. (Leipzig: Quelle und Meyer. 1916. Pp. xiii, 184. M. 4.40.)

THIS small volume from the pen of the eminent constitutional historian comprises two separate essays which in some degree traverse the same ground from different points of view. In the first division of the book (pp. 3–123) Below sketches the progress of German historical writing from the Wars of Liberation to the present time; in the second division (pp. 124–180) he discusses the economic interpretation of history for the same period, with special reference to the origins of the

doctrines of Karl Marx. The book is too slight and sketchy to afford more than a general survey of either field. It cannot in any measure fill the place of such manuals as Fueter, Gooch, and Wegele. But it has value as a rather definitely personal reaction to the course of German historiography during the nineteenth century.

The personal point of view emerges most evidently in the first half of the book, obviously written while German arms were still victorious in the Great War. The main thesis here is to show that the "romantic" school of political historians has contributed much to the upbuilding of German power. After concise treatment of Ranke and his times, the author traces the gradual defection of German historical scholarship from the liberal awakening of 1848, and its almost unqualified adherence to the policies of Bismarck and Wilhelm II. In the mind of the author this transfer of allegiance from the democratic liberal movement to the Prussian monarchy was fully justified by the need of a strong, united Germany. In this connection of course we hear of Dahlmann, Giesebrecht, Droysen, Max Duncker, von Sybel, Mommsen, Nietzsche, and lesser men, the goodly company ending with Heinrich von Treitschke.

The second thesis of the first part of the book has to do with the perennial controversy about the nature and scope of *Kulturgeschichte*, a controversy in which Below has borne a notable part. In this matter he seems to the reviewer to stand on more substantial ground. He endeavors to show that the real historians of German culture have not been the men who advertised themselves as such, but rather the workers in constitutional, economic, social, and cultural fields who sought through their special studies to interpret the general history of progress. Manifestly this part of the book is inspired by the polemic against Lamprecht and his school, although his name is studiously avoided.

In the second essay the author undertakes a less hackneyed theme and does some excellent constructive work. He endeavors to show that the economic interpretation of history as set forth by Marx and Engels in the *Manifest* of 1848 was not original with them, but rather derived from their reading of earlier and contemporary writers of the romantic school of historians. On the whole the case is well established, although at times the evidence is slender and not convincing. Below points out two sources for the emphasis on the economic factors in history which shows itself from about the middle of the century: the constitutional historians, and the local and territorial historians; and both of these stood wholly apart from the Socialist propaganda. Both of these groups, as well as the historical school of economists, have their roots in the romantic movement which, in the author's opinion, laid the foundation of German nationality.

The book is never unduly controversial, even when direct and earnest. But had it been written since November, 1918, it might have seen some things in a different perspective.

ARLEY B. SHOW.